UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/518,368	05/09/2005	Philippe Leyvraz	CC-5225-2 821	
23117 NIXON & VAN	7590 11/19/200 NDERHYE, PC	EXAMINER		
901 NORTH G	LEBE ROAD, 11TH F	HEINRICH, SAMUEL M		
ARLINGTON,	VA 22203		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		3742		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/19/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
10/518,368		LEYVRAZ, PHILIPPE	
Examiner		Art Unit	
	Samuel M. Heinrich	3742	

	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the	e cover sheet with the co	orrespondence address
THE REPLY	/ FILED <u>06 November 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICA	ATION IN CONDITION FO	OR ALLOWANCE.
applica applica for Co	ply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same ation, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1 ation in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with a ntinued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114) an amendment, affidavit, opeal fee) in compliance w	or other evidence, which places the vith 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
b) 🔀 Th no Ex Mo	ne period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Act be event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SI saminer Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). If time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the	ion, or (2) the date set forth in X MONTHS from the mailing CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE I	date of the final rejection. FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO
have been file under 37 CFF set forth in (b)	ed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and R 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened s) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	the corresponding amount of tatutory period for reply originate	f the fee. The appropriate extension fee ally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
filing tl	otice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension theres of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the tile NTS	eof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to a	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
3. ⊠ The p (a)⊠ (b)□	proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to They raise new issues that would require further consideration They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); They are not deemed to place the application in better form for	n and/or search (see NOTE	E below);
(d) 🗌	appeal; and/or They present additional claims without canceling a correspond NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41	ding number of finally reject.	cted claims.
5. 🔲 Applio	mendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See at cant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): y proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if:		,
non-al 7. For pu how th The st Claim(Claim(Claim(Claim(Claim(Claim(Claim(llowable claim(s). urposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below tatus of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: (s) allowed: (s) objected to: (s) rejected: 1-31,33 and 34. (s) withdrawn from consideration:	t be entered, or b) 🔲 will l	•
	OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
becau was no	ffidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or se applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient ot earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	reasons why the affidavit	or other evidence is necessary and
entere	ffidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of the detailed to overcome and because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome and a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was	all rejections under appeal	and/or appellant fails to provide a
REQUEST I	affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the sta FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		
See	request for reconsideration has been considered but does NO Continuation Sheet.		condition for allowance because:
12.	the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/0 r:	08) Paper No(s)	
		Samuel M Heinrich/ rimary Examiner, Art Un	nit 3742

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the amendments change the scope of the claims and require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that examiner has not identified a particular reference or references which are disclosed in AAPA (Applicant's Specification, Section Heading: State of the Art). The examiner is relying on the entire description in Applicant's Specification pertaining to the State of the Art. Examiner stated well known features are described in AAPA including laser marking, mirror beam guides, particular laser wavelengths used for texturing, particular workpiece, and CCD camera work inspection. Applicant argues that none of the references describe a control unit comprising a memory. This argument is not convincing. Computer control is well known and computer control has memory. Further Campbell, Jr. et al repeatedly describe a computer which holds a pattern in its memory. Computers are very well known and computer control of a process is known as a substitution for human control. Applicant argues none of the documents describe position detection or transport speed. Campbell, Jr. et al describes system control including tracking the position of the conveyor and describes for optimum production the conveyor runs at its fastest speed (column 14, lines 49-51). Applicant argues that the particular laser wavelength below 380 nm has not been used for depositing code marking. This reference, US20010009707A1, describes forming a textured surface on glass, glass-ceramic, or ceramic surfaces. The combination of a laser known to mark glass with a laser bottle marking apparatus would have been obvious at the time Applicant's invention was made. Applicant argues that the applied art are not closely related to the instant technical field. This argument is not convincing. The applied art pertains to laser drilling, marking, and cutting and are considered pertinent to the instant application.